EXHIBIT B

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

In Re: Uber Technologies,
Inc., Passenger Sexual Assault
Litigation.

| San Francisco,
| California
| June 26, 2025
| 10:42 a.m.

BEFORE: THE HONORABLE LISA J. CISNEROS, MAGISTRATE JUDGE

REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS VIA ZOOM VIDEOCONFERENCE

STATUS CONFERENCE

Official Court Reporter:
Andrea K. Bluedorn, RMR, CRR
Sandra Day O'Connor U.S. Courthouse, Suite 312
401 West Washington Street, SPC 34
Phoenix, Arizona 85003-2151
(602) 322-7245

Proceedings Reported by Stenographic Court Reporter Transcript Prepared by Computer-Aided Transcription

MS. VARTAIN: Your Honor, if I may comment. I think it makes sense to do some additional meeting and conferring along the lines of what Your Honor is suggesting. Although I — my initial reaction is that it doesn't make sense to think of this as adding another layer of regional specific sort of corporate discovery, and so I think the devil will be a little bit in the details and we should meet and confer on it.

But I just wanted to be clear that I don't think we should open up like a third tier of discovery that sits -- that adds a large amount of complexity to what has already been a highly voluminous and complex discovery process.

THE COURT: Yeah. That's not how I'm thinking of it now at this point, but -- and I also have questions about just how -- how common is this issue going to be, you know, how frequent is this even going to come up so --

MS. VARTAIN: So, Your Honor, on that point, like until -- until these four -- until the four persons who's are -- raised the objections that we're dealing with today, I thought it was very clear that we had case specific discovery that was very clearly defined as the Uber witness -- for the Uber witnesses -- as the people who touched a specific case, the investigators specifically. And so people with specific knowledge of a case.

And with these four additional people, the plaintiffs are sort of injecting a new tier of discovery that is not case

2.1

specific, and I think there's a way to resolve this along the lines of the Court's guidance. I just want to be very clear that I don't -- and I'm not hearing from the Court that we should expand into a new tier, and that I think is -- would be not appropriate at this juncture.

THE COURT: I guess what I'm hearing from you is that you -- a little bit may be more narrow than I think might be appropriate just because I'm not sure that the case specific discovery is limited to an employee who touched a -- a particular investigation, but maybe any employee who might have been involved in some manner with a specific case and that could either be through an investigation or some marketing material that the person who called the Uber service might have consumed or read or been an audience to it at some point so.

MS. VARTAIN: I think the Court's guidance is helpful on this and I think we can take it back. I believe the parties have an understanding between the parties as to what case specific is and we need to look at that agreement in light of the Court's guidance and see if we can quickly resolve.

THE COURT: Yeah.

MS. PETERS: Your Honor, may I raise a question about timing whether we would have a -- like a timeline to meet and confer or whether that would be a parallel track with Uber providing dates for witnesses, and then in the lead up to the depositions, we're meeting and conferring about sort of scope

CERTIFICATE

I, ANDREA K. BLUEDORN, do hereby certify that I am duly appointed and qualified to act as Official Court Reporter.

I FURTHER CERTIFY that the foregoing pages constitute a full, true, and accurate transcript of all of that portion of the proceedings contained herein, had in the above-entitled cause on the date specified therein, and that said transcript was prepared under my direction and control.

DATED this 26th day of June, 2025.

/s/Ardrea K. Buedorn, RMR, CRR